

REMARKS

Claims 1-27 are pending. Claims 1, 26 and 27 are independent. Claims 1, 7, 10, 26 and 27 have been amended. Claims 3-6 have been cancelled.

Claims 10-12 stand objected to due to certain informalities. By this Amendment, claim 10 has been amended to attend to the certain informalities, and withdrawal of the objections to claims 10-12 is requested.

Claims 1-5, 7-13, 15-18 and 23-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by "Spatio-Temporal Alignment of Sequences," Caspi and M. Irani, IEEE Trans. on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence. Volume 24, No. 11, pages 1409-1424, November 2002 (Caspi).

By this Amendment, claim 1 has been amended to include limitations of claim 6 which were deemed in the Office Action to result in the patentability of claim 6. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 1 is in patentable form, and withdrawal of the rejection to claim 1 is requested.

Claims 3-5 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer, thus mooted the rejections to those claims.

Claims 2, 7-13, 15-18 and 23-25 each ultimately depend from claim 1, and are therefore patentable over Caspi for at least the reason discussed above with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that claims 2, 7-13, 15-18 and 23-25 are in condition

for allowance and requests withdrawal of the rejections to those claims under 35 U.S.C. 102(a).

Claim 14 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over a combination of Caspi and U.S. Patent No. 4,786,979 (Claus). Applicants submit that, for a rejection to be proper under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the prior art references when combined must teach or suggest all the claim limitations (MPEP 706.02(j)).

Claim 14 depends from claim 1 and is therefore not taught or suggested by Caspi for at least the reason discussed above with respect to claim 1. Claus does not cure the deficiencies of Caspi. Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that claim 14 is in condition for allowance and request withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) to that claim.

Claim 21 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over a combination of Caspi and "Compensation of geometrical Deformations for Watermark Extraction in the Digital Cinema Application," Delannay et al., SPIE Security and Watermarking of Multimedia Contents III, Volume 4314, pages 149-157, August 2001 (Delannay). Applicants submit that, for a rejection to be proper under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the prior art references when combined must teach or suggest all the claim limitations (MPEP 706.02(j)).

Claim 21 depends from claim 1 and is therefore not taught or suggested by Caspi for at least the reason discussed above with respect to claim 1. Delannay does not cure the deficiencies of Caspi. Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that claim 21 is in condition for allowance and request withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) to that claim.

Claim 22 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatenable over a combination of Caspi and U.S. Patent No. 6,285,774 (Schumann). Applicants submit that, for a rejection to be proper under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the prior art references when combined must teach or suggest all the claim limitations (MPEP 706.02(j)).

Claim 22 depends from claim 1 and is therefore not taught or suggested by Caspi for at least the reason discussed above with respect to claim 1. Schumann does not cure the deficiencies of Caspi. Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that claim 22 is in condition for allowance and request withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) to that claim.

Claims 26 and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatenable over a combination of Caspi and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. U.S. 2002/0094135 A1 (the "'135 Publication"). Applicants submit that, for a rejection to be proper under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the prior art references when combined must teach or suggest all the claim limitations (MPEP 706.02(j)).

Claims 26 and 27 have been amended to include the limitations discussed above with respect to the patentability of claim 1, and are therefore not taught or suggested by Caspi for at least the reason discussed above with respect to claim 1. The '135 Publication does not cure the deficiencies of Caspi. Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that claims 26 and 27 are in condition for allowance and request withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) to those claims.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the currently-pending claims are in condition for allowance and favorable consideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 27 July 2007

/ James Dobrow /
By: James Dobrow
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 46,666

Mail all correspondence to:

Docket Administrator
Lowenstein Sandler PC
65 Livingston Avenue
Roseland, NJ 07068
Phone: (973) 597-2500